

REMARKS

By this Amendment, the Specification has been amended in a clarifying manner, Claims 1, 2, 8 and 16 have been amended, and Claims 5, 6, 7 and 17 have been deleted, without prejudice, to place this application in immediate condition for allowance.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has rejected the Claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, in that, allegedly, the recitation of a “one-dimensional light detector” is inaccurate since the array is inherently two-dimensional. In order to clarify this issue, the Specification has been amended on page 6 to specify, in conformance with the disclosure as filed including the drawing figures, that the array 30 comprises “a single linear row or column of active elements.” It is respectfully submitted that the Specification as well as the drawing figures, particularly Figures 5, 6 and 7, provide clear support for this recitation. Furthermore, independent Claim 1 has been amended to now recite: “a one-dimensional light detector comprising a single linear row or column of active elements adjacent said space ...”. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Claims are now fully definite under the purview of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has made various grounds of rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a) in reliance upon U.S. Patent No. 5,502,568 to Ogawa alone or in combination with U.S. Patent No. 4,092,072 to Ellis. Additionally, the Examiner has indicated the allowability of Claims 7-11 and 17-20 were they to be rewritten in independent form. Dependent Claim 7 as previously presented consisted of the combination of Claims 1 and 5-7. Claim 17 as previously presented consisted of the combination of Claims 16 and 17. Accordingly, in accordance with the Examiner’s indication of allowability, Claims 7 and 17 have

been rewritten in independent form by amending Claim 1 to incorporate therein the limitations of Claims 5-7 and by amending Claim 16 to incorporate therein the limitations of Claim 17. Claims 5-7 and 17 have been deleted without prejudice and Claim 8 has been amended to change its dependency in light of the amendments described above. Based upon these amendments, all of the claims are believed to patentably distinguish from the prior art and to be fully definite under the purview of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Additionally, dependent Claim 2 has been amended in a clarifying manner.

As such, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. As such, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully solicited.

Although this Amendment is presented after a Final Rejection, it is respectfully submitted that it should be entered since it places the application in clear condition for allowance and removes any issues that might be present on Appeal. The amendments made to the claims rewrite claims indicated as allowable in independent form. Moreover, a formal issue concerning indefiniteness has been cured through minor formal amendments to the Specification and Claim 1. The Examiner should be able to quickly review the application and confirm that all issues raised in the Final Office Action have been satisfactorily resolved.

If, for any reason, the Examiner believes that an interview with Applicant's Attorney would be helpful in expediting the prosecution of this patent application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone Applicant's Attorney locally at (703) 619-0101, so that a discussion of any outstanding issues may be had.

Again, entry of this Amendment, reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

H. JAY SPIEGEL & ASSOCIATES



H. Jay Spiegel
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 30,722

H. JAY SPIEGEL & ASSOCIATES
P.O. Box 11
Mount Vernon, Virginia 22121
(703) 619-0101 - Phone
(703) 619-0110- Facsimile